

THE INTERNATIONAL CODE OF ZOOLOGICAL
NOMENCLATURE: RESULT OF VOTE ON PROPOSALS FOR
SUBSTANTIVE AMENDMENTS (FIRST INSTALMENT).
Z.N.(G.) 182

By the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature

In November 1977, the Editorial Committee appointed to prepare the Third Edition of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature published a first instalment of its proposals for substantive amendments to the Code and Constitution in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 167–175. This paper appeared at the same time as the committee's sixth draft of the Third Edition was published and available for comment. Notices of the publication of this paper and of the Sixth Draft were sent to a number of scientific journals.

2. The Editorial Committee's paper contained 25 proposals for the amendment of the Code and Constitution of the Commission. Under Article 16 of the Constitution, the Commission could not vote on these proposals until a year after their publication. When the time came to submit them for a vote, the Editorial Committee took the view that its consideration of eight of the proposals was not sufficiently advanced for a vote to be taken on them, and that one proposal should be withdrawn. One proposal was divided into two parts, so that seventeen points were presented for voting.

3. In Voting Paper (79)1 issued under the Three-Month Rule on 14 March 1979, all 25 points were listed and the members of the Commission were invited to vote for or against the principle of each, without commitment to a particular form of words. At the close of the voting period on 14 June the state of the voting was as follows:

	For	Against
(1) Should the Glossary form part of the Code?	18	0
(2) Should the term "epithet" replace the term "specific name"?	RESERVED	
(3) Criteria of publication	RESERVED	
(4) Definition of an available compound epithet	16	1
(5) Should a single combined description of a new genus and a new species continue to make both names available after 1930 (as it already does for names published before 1931)?	18	0

(6) Extension of acceptance of bibliographic references as indications	16	2
(7) Should the mandatory provision that a comma be inserted between author and date (when cited) be reduced to a Recommendation?	13	5
(8) Greek (etc.) epithets to be indeclinable	RESERVED	
(9) Deletion of Article 29d adopted at Monaco (see <i>Bull. zool. Nom.</i> vol. 31: 80, 81)	13	2
(10) Refined differentiation between different kinds of subsequent spelling	16	1
(11) Correction of diacritic marks	RESERVED	
(12) Use of "i" and "ii" as permissible alternatives	RESERVED	
(13) Homonymy between names of type genera	17	1
(14) (a) Authorship of names published in synonymy	17	0
(b) Types of taxa denoted by names published in synonymy	15	2
(15) Status of the fourth term in quadriminals	16	1
(16) Proposed additions to Article 58	17	1
(17) Suggestion that "generitype" be adopted in place of type species	WITHDRAWN	
(18) Deletion of Code Article 67e concerning objective synonymy of the name of a type species	17	1
(19) Status of single surviving specimen when it is not known whether the species-group taxon was based on one specimen or more than one	RESERVED	
(20) Multiple type specimens in Protozoa	RESERVED	
(21) Use of term "type of a name" or "type of a nominal taxon"?	RESERVED	
(22) Enlargement of number of members of Council	16	2
(23) Secretary to Commission to be secretary to Council	17	1
(24) Term of office of Secretary	18	0
(25) Removal of requirement to publish (other than in <i>Bull. zool. Nom.</i>) notices of proposals for amendment of the Constitution	16	1

Voting papers were not returned by the following members of the Commission: Bayer, Eisenmann, Habe, Kraus, Tortonese, Welch, Trjapitzin. Brinck was on leave of absence.

Holthuis abstained on point 4; Dupuis on 9, 10 and 15; Cogger on 9; Binder on 9 and 14a; and Starobogatov on point 25.

The following comments were sent in by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Dupuis: "Point 7: "A mon avis, aucune ponctuation n'est nécessaire entre le nom d'auteur et la date.

"Point 9: A mon avis, la priorité des auteurs et dates des noms en question doit être sauvegardée, quelle que soit la correction orthographique qui s'impose.

"Point 15: For, si l'on précise 'outside the scope of the present Code.' Against, si 'excluded from zoological nomenclature.'

"Points 22, 23: Je ne suis pas favorable à la notion du Conseil. Je ne reconnais que des membres de la Commission égaux en droits et je souhaiterais simplement un bureau exécutif (executive committee).

"Point 25: La Commission, qui n'a plus un 'support' aussi large que du temps des congrès de zoologie, a tendance à se considérer comme autonome, omnipotente et autoreproductible. La disposition prévue accroîtrait encore ce repliement et ce secret autarciques que je considère comme dangereux."

Alvarado: "My vote against Point 7, and the votes for, are in accordance with the opinions of the Entomological Working Group of the Spanish Society of Natural History and other zoologists, and do not reflect only my personal opinions on these matters."

Ride: "Point 18: Article 67e. Providing that a designation made in contravention of the new provision would remain valid but the name of the type species should be correctly cited by subsequent authors."

Nye: "Point 18: Article 67e of the 1964 Code was a watered-down version of Declaration 21 and dealt with how the name of a type species (after fixation) should be cited in the special case of its being a junior objective synonym. Article 67e of the Sixth Draft of the third edition appears to extend this rule to cases where a type species, when fixed, is denoted by a junior subjective synonym.

"The explanation of the EC proposals on this point (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 34: 172) is confusing and does not agree with the draft provision. Draft Article 67e gives mandatory force to only part of Recommendation 69C of 1964 (which has been deleted as such). There are in fact two points involved here, and they should be analysed separately:

(A) What is acceptable as a type-species fixation?

(B) How should a type species be cited after fixation?

"(A). What is acceptable as a type-species fixation is reasonably well defined in the 1964 Code and the Sixth Draft, except that it is not made clear whether one made by citing the name of the type species under an objective synonym is to be accepted as valid or not. For example, in the Lepidoptera, *Epicoma* Hübner, [1819], had an originally included nominal species *Epicoma tristis* Hübner, [1819], which is a junior secondary homonym of *Bombyx tristis* Donovan, 1805. A new replacement name, *Epicoma contristis*, was published by Hübner in 1823, and the species was cited under that name when it was fixed as type of the genus by Kirby, 1892. Is this fixation valid or not? Commonsense indicates that emendations, new replacement names and other objective synonyms, if denoting

the same type species with the same type specimen, should be regarded as different spellings or names for the same nominal taxon. However, in both the 1964 Code and the Sixth Draft, a genus-group name and its new replacement name are regarded as denoting different nominal taxa [Art. 67i], and this seems to me incorrect. The provision should be reworded to read 'both names denote the same nominal taxon'.

"The above concept could be incorporated into Article 69a (iv) as:

'(iv) If an author fixes (or accepts another's fixation) as type species, either

- (1) a nominal species denoted by an objective synonym of the epithet under which it was originally included, or
- (2) a nominal species that was not originally included, and if, but only if, at the same time he places that nominal species in synonymy with one of the originally included species, his act constitutes the designation of the originally included nominal species as the type species of the nominal genus-group taxon.'

"(B) I agree with what I think the EC is trying to say, that is that the type species should be cited under the same epithet (if available) that was used for it when it was originally included in the genus. Article 67e should be reduced to a Recommendation (Recommendation 67B) as:

'Citation of type species following fixation. — The name of a nominal species, type of a genus-group taxon, should be cited first by the original combination by which it was denoted when it was first included in that taxon, and secondly by its current valid combination if that is different.'

Bernardi: "Point 15: 'For' avec réserves. Cette disposition était implicitement contenue dans la deuxième édition du Code et mal comprise par de nombreux zoologistes. Il était donc utile de l'exprimer clairement. Mais elle conduit à un chaos en ce qui concerne (1) les noms utilisés pour exprimer la variation géographique, et (2) les noms des auteurs de ces noms."

Hahn: "Point 16: I agree to add (3) and (4) to Art. 58. But do you think that (15) is indeed helpful? There are some names, now available, that would become homonyms if this provision were adopted. For example, in the genus *Brachymetopus* we have *B. uralicus* (de Verneuil, 1845) and *B. strzeleckii uralicus* (V.N. Weber, 1937). The 'ou' and 'u' are not identical. But these names differ in spelling only from the use of different systems of transliteration. If clause (15) is added to Article 58, the younger name

will have to be replaced, so that the additional clause would not promote stability of nomenclature.”

DECLARATION OF RESULT OF VOTE

The result of the vote on V.P. (79)1 is that all the points submitted for a vote received the two-thirds affirmative majority required under Article 16a(v) of the Constitution. The publication of this report therefore constitutes the corresponding recommendation by the Commission to the Congress that the proposed amendments be incorporated into the Code, in words to be prepared by the Editorial Committee for the Commission's approval.

R.V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

18 June 1979